



**Pedestrian and Bicyclist Roundtable
Issues Report
Meeting Date October 6, 2005**

The pedestrian and bicyclist roundtable discussion was held on October 6, 2005 from 1– 3 pm, in UDOT’s Administrative Office Conference Room A & B. The purpose of the discussion was to identify issues and needs for consideration during the 2006 Update of the 2003 Long Range Plan. Eighteen participants were invited by UDOT with 17 attending from Grand, Washington, Wasatch, Utah, Cache, Weber, Davis, Summit and Salt Lake counties. The one person unable to attend forwarded his written comments (see Attachment A, pages 7-8 below).

Participants were greeted and given name tags. UDOT staff began with an overview of the planning process by UDOT Planning staff and a professional facilitator then facilitated the roundtable discussion. Participants introduced themselves and discussed what they hoped the future would look like for bicyclists and pedestrians. Comments were logged in written form on poster board sheets and posted around the room. At the close of the discussion, participants were asked to rank their top priorities from all the comments posted around the room. A copy of the agenda and the original written meeting transcript of the actual comments can be found in the UDOT Planning Project File by contacting Sandy Weinrauch at sweinrauch@utah.gov or at 801-965-3897.

This document (pages 1-3) is a summary of the roundtable discussion as detailed in the verbatim comments that follow (pages 4-6) and the written comments submitted (pages 7-8).

Desired Future Conditions – 20 Year Vision

UDOT will have adopted and implemented a “Complete Streets Policy”, which provides safe facilities for multimodal transportation. Bicyclists and pedestrians are respected and treated as “road user” equals with motorized vehicles, with equal accommodations. There is cooperation and communication between federal, state and local officials regarding funding, planning and building trails. A tighter connection is desired between UDOT and the bicycling coalitions in advocating issues. That future pedestrian and bicycle road use is planned as a forethought rather than an afterthought.

That Utah becomes a model for a safe, functional, progressive, non-motorized trail system with statewide-interconnected access between rural and urban areas. There is demonstrated support for day-to-day expansion of multimodal transportation opportunities utilizing biking, walking and transit (both urban and rural) as competitive land use needs continue to evolve. The state prioritizes development and/or expansion of a “cutting-edge” public education safety campaign for motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian users with awareness of and caution for each other’s needs. That there are safe routes to schools throughout the state. Maintenance of

the bike and pedestrian infrastructure is consistent among UDOT Regions and continuous, especially in the winter.

Top Three Pedestrian and Bicycle Priorities for UDOT Consideration:

1. To establish a "Complete Streets Policy" for all new construction and reconstruction projects.
2. To implement a statewide Bicycle/Pedestrian/Motor Vehicle Safety Education campaign emphasizing awareness of and caution for each other's needs.
3. To provide the necessary roadway space (shoulder, street width, bike lane, etc.) needed for bicyclists and motorists to comply with the 3-foot passing law.

Content Analysis – Issues Summary

Systems Planning and Programming

Both pedestrian and bicyclists stated there is a need for UDOT to establish a "Complete Streets Policy" for all new construction and reconstruction projects and a desire for the alternative transportation community to routinely be involved in transportation master planning. UDOT is encouraged to partner with local communities to highlight the benefits of biking and walking.

There is a desire to establish uniform pavement maintenance standards that address bicyclists needs (grates, seams, utility covers, patches, shoulders/edges) and a need for UDOT to provide the roadway space necessary for bicyclists and motorists to comply with the 3-foot passing law. Both groups expressed a desire for UDOT to provide over- or under-crossings of major roadways that otherwise block access.

At actuated signalized intersections UDOT should use equipment that is capable of detecting a bicyclist in proper position (i.e. not next to the curb). Several people mentioned installing pavement bulb-outs at diagonal railroad crossings to allow bicyclists to safely cross perpendicular to the tracks. The pedestrian representatives discussed the desire that the missing links in sidewalk networks be connected during road construction instead of waiting for a developer.

Both groups discussed the need to consider commuter versus recreational travel and rural versus urban needs before **designating the road purpose??**.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Motor Vehicle Safety Education

There is a need to educate the public by implementing a public education safety campaign with the same intensity as an anti-smoking or seatbelt campaign.

Maintenance and Operation

There is a need to establish gravel/debris sweeping standards, since the roadway edge where bicyclists are expected to ride often is where these materials collect.

The pedestrian groups are concerned that snow removal blocks sidewalks and/or crosswalks and makes it difficult for pedestrian travel and recommended that roadway snow removal be prohibited from blocking sidewalks and/or crosswalks.

They also made a recommendation that sidewalks be cleared of snow at public expense just as roadways are.

Both groups discussed the need to create full-time salaried positions to administer the Safe Routes to School program.

Enhancements

There is a general call to improve facilities creating more paths/lanes/routes with appropriate signage and pavement markings.

Partnerships

Both groups encouraged UDOT to partner with the Department of Public Safety to focus more on enforcement of cycling-related traffic violations (motorists/bicyclists/pedestrians) and a need to prosecute motorized/non-motorized accidents. Partnering with local governments to encourage the installation of secure, protected bike parking at likely destinations (libraries, parks, schools, businesses, shopping centers, etc.) and to educate on funding resources available would be a benefit. A desire was expressed for UDOT to continue to partner with UTA to encourage the integration of bicycling more fully with public transit.

Funding

The meeting representatives also expressed a need to reprioritize UDOT funding to allocate additional monies for bike and pedestrian facilities. UDOT funding should also continue to be provided for support of the bi yearly Trails Conference. Continuing support of the Legacy Trails initiative prepared by Utah Parks and Recreation and detailed in the 2003 UDOT LRP.

Definitions:

AASHTO – American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials

LRP – Long Range Plan

PM – Project Manager

UDOT – Utah Department of Transportation

UTA – Utah Transit Authority

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Roundtable Verbatim Comments October 6, 2005

The numbers in parenthesis reflects the number of votes (via dots) an issue received during the prioritization section of the roundtable discussion.

Vision Statements

- ♣ Bicyclist and pedestrians are treated as equals with equal accommodations
- ♣ Bike and pedestrian needs are equal to motorists
- ♣ UDOT has adopted and implements a "Complete Streets Policy"
- ♣ There is a tighter connection between UDOT and cycling coalition in advocating issues (1)
- ♣ There are safe routes to schools.
- ♣ More cooperation and communications between Federal, state and local officials regarding funding, planning and building
- ♣ Roads are designed and maintained for bike and pedestrian users (1)
- ♣ Pedestrian and bicycle road use is planned from the beginning. Their use is a "forethought instead of an afterthought" (4)
- ♣ Bikes and pedestrian use is institutionalized — part of UDOT's standards for road building (5)
- ♣ Bike and pedestrian use is a priority in review of plans
- ♣ There is continuity and maintenance of infrastructure for bikes and pedestrians especially in the winter
- ♣ There is a safe, functional, progressive, non-motorized trail system in the state of Utah (1)
- ♣ Utah is the model state for encouraging bike/pedestrian use.
- ♣ There is full biking access into the city
- ♣ There is a bike and pedestrian network that interconnects (6)
- ♣ Bikers and walkers are respected
- ♣ Biking and walking is easy—easier
- ♣ Drivers, bicyclist and pedestrians understand the rules of the road. Fines are increased for those who don't
- ♣ All bike riders know how to function on the road. (laws, rules and etiquette)
- ♣ There are shared-use trails
- ♣ There are comfortable, connected and convenient roads between communities.
- ♣ Students are educated about the benefits of biking and walking (1)
- ♣ Students are educated on the laws of biking and walking in and along the roadways
- ♣ Society is dependent upon biking and walking
- ♣ Every major street has a raised bike lane (1)
- ♣ Land use has evolved to minimize the use of motorized vehicles
- ♣ Misplaced fears are gone such as "fear from the rear."
- ♣ Transit is an integral part of the bike/pedestrian interconnected network.

Specific Needs and Issues

1. Focus on the four “Es”. Engineering, encouragement, enforcement and education.

Funding

2. Increase funding for bike and pedestrian facilities
3. Reprioritize money UDOT already has
4. Support for Legacy Trails (3)
5. Support for Trails Conference
6. Create full-time salaried positions to administer Safe Routes to School programs.

Development and Planning Policy

7. Establish a “Complete Streets” Policy (for all new construction and reconstruction). (13)
 - a. Establish uniform pavement maintenance standards that address bicyclist’s needs (grates, seams, utility covers, patches, shoulders/edges). (3)
 - i. For example: 33rd South (1)
 - ii. Rumble strips are “impossible” for bike riders if they are too wide.
 - iii. Continuity and maintenance of infrastructure in the winter. (1)
 - b. Provide the roadway space necessary for bicyclists and motorists to comply with the 3-foot law. (6)
 - c. Separate pedestrian were necessary; don’t separate bikes unless road serves an additional purpose such as scenic or limited access. Consider commuter vs. recreation and rural vs. urban needs before designating.
 - d. Establish gravel/debris sweeping standards, since the roadway edge where bicyclists are expected to ride often is where stuff collects.
 - e. At actuated signalized intersections, use equipment that is capable of detecting a bicyclist in proper position (i.e. not next to the curb).
 - f. Install pavement bulb-outs at diagonal railroad installing pavement bulb-outs at diagonal railroad crossings to allow bicyclists to safely cross perpendicular to the tracks.
 - g. Clear sidewalks of snow at public expense just as roadways.
 - h. Prohibit roadway snow removal from blocking sidewalks and/or crosswalks.
8. Routinely include the alternative transportation community in master planning.

Connectivity

9. Provide over- or under-crossings of major roadways that would otherwise block access.
10. Connect missing links in sidewalk networks. (Roads are built without adjacent property development so sidewalks should not have to wait for a developer.)
11. Improve facilities.

- i. Create more paths/lanes/routes with appropriate signage and pavement markings. (Salt Lake County is doing a good job at coming up to speed on this, but designated bike lanes and route markings are non-existent in Weber County.)
- j. Bridges need to provide enough space for bike and pedestrian
- k. Underpasses/overpasses are needed for bikes and pedestrians (SPUI's don't work for bikers).
- l. Provide safe routes to schools. (2)

Safety Education

- 12. Educate the public - Public Motor Vehicle Bicycle Awareness- There are still motorists that feel bicyclists do not belong on the road and do not realize bicycles have a right to the road. For example: 1. Bicyclists have the same rights/responsibilities as motorists. 2. Motorists are required by law to give at least 3 feet when passing. 3. Following vehicular traffic rules is the safest way to cycle. 4. Urban bicyclists' biggest dangers occur at intersections, not from being overtaken from behind (recent high-profile overtaking accidents notwithstanding).
 - m. Implement Bike/Ped safety campaigns with the intensity of an anti-smoking or seatbelt campaign. (8)
 - n. More bicycle road side signs, road markings
 - i. Use all media—billboard/newspaper/TV/radio
- 13. Create full-time salary positions to administer Safe Routes to Schools programs.

Partnerships

- 14. Partner with the Department of Public Safety to focus more on
 - o. enforcement of cycling-related traffic violations (motorists *and* bicyclists).
 - p. enforcement of motorists properly yielding to pedestrians.
- 15. Partner with local communities to encourage
 - q. urban planning that makes walking viable by having destinations in proximity to each other
 - r. the installation of secure, protected bike parking at likely destinations (libraries, parks, schools, businesses, shopping centers, etc.) and educate on funding resources available.
 - s. Educate on the need to prosecute motorized/non-motorized accidents. (2)
- 16. Partner with UTA to encourage the integration of cycling more fully with public transit. (Buses can carry two bikes, but there is no provision for someone if the rack is already full. A solution is needed for this problem.) (1)

General

- 17. Be creative in interpreting "AASHTO Standards."
 - a. Institutionalize standards (1)
- 18. Help ensure uniformity between UDOT Regions on bike policies.
- 19. Educate UDOT PM's on bike and pedestrian design needs and standards.(1)

The Weber County/Northern Davis Concerns submitted in writing follow in **Attachment A**.

| Attachment A - Weber County/Northern Davis Concerns | | |
|--|---|---|
| Bicycle Commuting Ranked Highest to Lowest | | |
| Road | Problem | Recommended Solution |
| Riverdale Rd (State 60) | Inconsistent lane edge marking. Road has been recently rejuvenated in sections. Shoulder area is wide enough, but there is no designated lane boundary. Some section have white line, some sections don't. | Designated bicycle lane markings. Clean road more frequently. |
| 300 W /5000 S (From Riverdale rd to US 89) | No lane edge markings. No bicycle lane. This road is the most used connector route from SE Ogden to Riverdale rd. The road was recently re-built. There is no lane boundary markings (white line). The west end of road has no street light at all. Very dark and dangerous for commuters. | Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| US-89 | No bicycle lane markings There is a good wide shoulder on this road from Davis county to Ogden, but there needs to be designated bicycle lane markings. Cars need to be made aware that bicycles have a right to the road. This is a high speed, high volume road. There have been many serious bicycle/motorist collisions on this road. The section of road at the US-89/I-84 intersection (mouth of Weber Canyon) is very busy and dangerous during after work rush hour. This area is also <u>CONSTANTLY CLUTTERED WITH DEBRIS.</u> There is a gravel pit in this area that drops gravel on the road daily. I feel the owner of the gravel pit should be responsible for the mess and dangerous conditions they create. | Designated bicycle lane markings. Clean road more frequently |
| State 60 South Weber Dr. | No Shoulder area. No bicycle lane markings. This is a good bicycle commuter and recreational route. In some sections the road has been rebuilt and there is ample shoulder, but the majority of this road has no shoulder. | Build shoulder area. Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| State 203 Harrison Blvd. | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. Major commuter route. Shoulder is adequate but parked cars create dangerous conditions. | Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| State 126 1900 W (Roy) | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. Major commuter route. Shoulder is adequate but no lane edge markings. | Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| State 108 Midland Dr | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. This road has been re-built in sections over the past few years, but there was no consideration for widening it to allow safe bicycling. | Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| Recreational Riding | | |
| State 39 Ogden Canyon | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. Ogden canyon has improved over the years, but there are sections with insufficient shoulder area. This road has a high volume of weekend traffic consisting of many | Separate bicycle path Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle signs. Designated bicycle lane |

| Attachment A - Weber County/Northern Davis Concerns | | |
|--|--|--|
| Bicycle Commuting Ranked Highest to Lowest | | |
| Road | Problem | Recommended Solution |
| | RVs and trailers. Very dangerous for cyclist. There is separate dirt path that runs approx. a third of the way up the canyon. This path could easily be extended and paved to allow a safe and enjoyable recreational experience for the community. The Ogden Canyon Club seems to have a strangle hold on government officials and will not allow access. The selfishness of a few are denying a exceptional recreational amenity for the community. | markings. |
| State 158/39 Pineview Reservoir perimeter roads | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. The roads running the circumference of Pineview reservoir are a popular weekend route. The roads are inconsistent in shoulder area and in spot non-existent. These roads need to be reworked to extend shoulder area and safety. | Build shoulder area. Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| Bike Path adjacent to Weber River corridor | Weber River Bike Path needs completion. The bike path from 17 th street in Ogden to the mouth of Weber Canyon needs to be completed. The path from Ogden canyon to 17 th is done but there is no progress down the Weber river. It seems Riverdale and Uintah officials see no importance in what would complete a great recreational bicycle loop. Again, selfishness of a few Riverdale/Uintah homeowners of property access is denying the community. | Complete Bike Path |
| State 167/66/65 Morgan Valley area. | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. This is a popular area for weekend cyclist. The roads are rural and traffic volume is relatively low. Some areas the shoulder is non existent. | Build shoulder area. Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. Designated bicycle signs. |
| I-84 From US89 to Mountain Green exit. | CONSTANTLY CLUTTERED WITH DEBRIS. This is the only access to Morgan valley area. The shoulder is very good, but in areas it is unusable because leftover winter road salt/sanding, rocks, lumber, hubcaps, miscellaneous chunks of metal and debris. | Clean road more frequently. Designated bicycle signs. |
| State 134/37/110 West Weber County area | No bicycle lane. No bicycle lane markings. Popular area for weekend riding. Shoulder area and lane markings are in-consistent. | Build shoulder area. Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. |
| State 108/127 & Antelope Island access | No bicycle lane markings Reduce the \$4/ head Antelope Island bicycle fee 108 and 127 leading to Antelope island have good shoulder but need markings. Antelope Island access road is great. Wide lane, low traffic but that fee is ridiculous. Based on the low impact a bicycle has on the road and the minimal use of the facilities, I think a nominal \$.50 fee would be fair and equitable. | Designated bicycle lane. Designated bicycle lane markings. Reduce access fee |